



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE TRUE BASIS FOR AMERICA'S WORLD INFLUENCE

BY THOMAS P. GORE,

United States Senator from Oklahoma.

There is a peculiar propriety, there is a double fitness in the discussion of the present subject in the city of Philadelphia. This city was christened in the very name of human fraternity. It was dedicated to the sentiment—shall I say to the unrealized dream?—of the brotherhood of man. It was founded and builded upon the principle that man is in some sense his brother's keeper and should not become his brother's butcher, a principle which would deny the sufficiency of Cain's answer, had he answered the question, "Where is Abel, thy brother?" by saying that he lived across the border. Such an answer would have challenged the very spirit of humanity. Few, if any, will agree with Bax when he says that the day is fast approaching when to call a man a patriot will be the deepest insult which can be offered him. Hardly more in this country will agree with Bernhardt or Reumelin when they declare that patriotism is the circumference of morality and that the moral law does not bind the sovereign state. Between these extremes there are those of us who believe that the love of country is not only a noble virtue but is a virtue essential to organized society.

Starr King declared that self-love is the freezing point of the social virtues. Beyond and better than this is the love of family and the love of country, both of which have their proper places in the social and moral economy. Much as we cherish these sentiments, much as we respect these virtues, we cannot choose but agree with Miss Edith Cavell when she said, with the light of another world breaking in her face, "Patriotism is not enough." No sublimer sentiment has been uttered since Gethsemane. Whatever else this may mean it means that beyond patriotism there is a principle of humanity, a principle of good will which should be held sacred, inviolate and universal. This principle must be the basis of international law, the soul of international justice. It should be the sovereign principle of every nation which assumes to be or aspires to become a world power.

I say there is a double fitness in this discussion in this city because Philadelphia is the birthplace of the United States as an independent nation. Nay, more, it is the birthplace of the United States as a world power. The United States became a world power on July 4, 1776. The Declaration of Independence was the greatest moral force set in motion among the sons of men since the sun veiled itself in darkness rather than witness the Divine Tragedy. When Charles James Fox heard of the destruction of the Bastille he exclaimed, "How much is this the best and greatest event in the history of the world?" It was not so great an event as the Declaration of Independence. It was largely the effect, the lineal descendant of that Declaration. The self-evident truths set forth in that indictment of tyranny have been leavening the entire world with the spirit of liberty, equality and fraternity. These principles account for many a revolution in western Europe, and even the silent, brooding East with its mighty millions has during the present century felt the deferred but quickening impulse of the selfsame principles. This new conception of the rights of man has in some measure affected the status of every living human being. It has lent a new dignity to human nature itself. It has been a beacon to the oppressed and to the persecuted everywhere.

The influence of the United States as a world power has further made itself felt as affecting the individual in the abolition of the doctrine of infeasible allegiance and in the establishment of the principle of voluntary expatriation.

The United States became a world power when in its very cradle it drove the British Lion—if I may so say—halt and bleeding from the Thirteen Colonies, when it triumphed in arms over an embattled empire, the mightiest upon the globe. The United States was acting as a world power when it refused to submit to the multiplying injuries and insults of the Barbary States and rescued the commerce of christendom from a tolerated piracy which had continued for centuries.

That the United States is a world power was further evidenced when in a second passage at arms with Great Britain it abrogated the pretensions of that and other countries in regard to the impressment of sailors and seamen and established in theory, if not in fact, the freedom of the seas. It was the voice of a world power when the United States proclaimed the Monroe Doctrine and placed itself

as a bar in the pathway of the holy alliance in its effort to resubjugate the emancipated Spanish colonies in America. By that one act alone the United States erected a permanent safeguard in the new world against the ambition and encroachment of the old, gave the western hemisphere an identity and destiny of its own. When the United States prevailed upon Japan to unbolt the doors of that hermit kingdom to the advent of western civilization it breathed the breath of a new life into the dead and dying Orient.

I cannot accept the theory that the United States became a world power as a consequence of the Spanish-American War. The character of a nation as a world power must be determined by two considerations. First, the character of the ends which it seeks to accomplish in world politics. Second, the character of the means which it employs for the accomplishment of these ends. The effect of a nation's activities as a world power depends not entirely upon its own intentions or the character of its means and its ends, but depends largely upon the opinion, indeed, I may add, upon the suspicions, which other nations may entertain as to its intentions, its means and its ends. World power must be exercised through one of two forces, or through a combination of two forces. I mean moral forces and military force.

In the main I shall leave others to judge as to the character of the objects which the United States has sought as a world power and as to the character of the means which it has employed. I shall leave others to conclude for themselves whether the United States has relied upon moral forces rather than upon military force in the prosecution of that splendid career in world politics which she has hitherto achieved.

Of course, it was our vast military and naval establishment which enabled us to vindicate the Declaration of Independence and create this republic. It was our trained regulars, our seasoned veterans which enabled us to triumph over the raw recruits, the undisciplined militia of Great Britain. It was our vast naval and military establishment, it was our universal compulsory military service which brought victory to our arms in the War of 1812, in the Mexican War and in the majestic struggle for the perpetuation of the Union. Does not such a suggestion rob our history of its chiefest splendor and rob our greatest national achievements of their true moral worth and significance?

We have never been a nation in arms. We should never be a nation in arms. We have, indeed, maintained moderate naval and military establishments; relatively they have been small. Our moral and political conquests have been out of all proportion to our organized militant forces.

Few Americans, if any, believe in peace at any price, unless they mean by that at the price even of war. No one who cherishes the traditions of this republic, certainly no one living in Philadelphia, will assert that all wars are dishonorable. The Revolution was surcharged with glory. The necessity and the justice of a war must determine its character. Disarmament will not be adopted as a practical policy by any one country unless it be made universal. One reason is that the worst of two countries can determine whether they shall have peace or war. Unhappily, goodwill is not always a buckler against bayonets. The triple armor afforded by a just quarrel is not impervious either to arrowheads or to 42-centimeter projectiles. No nation should be too proud to do right. Herein lies one of the chief evils and dangers of militarism. A sense of power is calculated to breed an indifference to justice. Might usurps the jurisdiction of right.

What just foreign policy have we ever undertaken as a world power and failed to prosecute to success merely through the want of a greater army and a greater navy? What just foreign policy would we have undertaken but which we forbore to undertake for the lack of a larger military and naval establishment? Upon what great foreign policy would we now embark but for the sense of naval and military weakness and inferiority? As a world power, should force or justice be the soul and the support of our foreign policies? If an irresistible army and navy be essential to our character as a world power will they be less essential to the success of other nations as world powers? If we had such irresistible forces would we embark upon foreign policies which lie outside the scope and possibility of moral conquest? Would we embark upon policies to the accomplishment of which only armed forces were adequate? Would such a course promise greater success and greater service to mankind than we have already accomplished? Would it promise more of good than of evil?

In politics, for the want of a better guide, we must resort to precedent and analogy. Have vast naval and military armaments

has preparedness, enabled other nations to work out their destinies as world powers without war? There are two points of view. The first is that preparedness averts war. Of course this is true; universal experience bears witness to its truth. Germany's unrivaled preparedness has kept the world at peace. But for universal compulsory service perhaps Germany might at this hour be involved in war. France has universal compulsory service. She is enjoying its inevitable consequences—unmolested peace. Russia has universal compulsory service—the war god is a stranger to her shores. Italy and Austria enjoy all the blessings of peace which are inseparable from universal service. Great Britain is the master, the mightiest navy upon the seven seas. This has been her pledge of peace and her security against war and its calamities.

I have always noticed that the strongest of tooth and claw are by nature gentle and amiable. By a sort of instinct they exemplify the virtues of the peacemaker. The lion is a symbol of physical strength and prowess. He employs that strength only for the security and protection of the defenceless. The tiger's claw is a sort of refuge for the affrighted fugitives of the forest and his stripes are the Red Cross or the white flag of the jungle. The beak and talons of the eagle are an ark of safety to the doves of peace. The serpent's fangs were designed and are used not to bruise but to protect the heels of Adam's children—perhaps you have noticed that. This might be called the irony of nature.

We are as well prepared today both for domestic and foreign policies and protection as we have ever been in our history. We have never engaged in a foreign war not of our own declaring. No nation under the sun has ever declared war against the United States.

The other point of view is this: I heard a senator assert the other day that unpreparedness is the pathway that leads to war. Of course, the senator reasoned well. Who will be so bold as to deny that unpreparedness for war begets war? Was it not the unpreparedness of Germany that precipitated her into this holocaust of blood and fire? Was it not unpreparedness on the part of Russia and on the part of France that broke their peace and dragged them into this carnival of slaughter? Was it not unpreparedness on the part of Austria, Italy and Great Britain that plunged them headlong into this whirlpool of blood, this whirlwind of flame? Who

will deny that unpreparedness caused this war? Who will deny that preparedness would have prevented this war? Is not this the logic of militarism?

Did it ever occur to you that every nation on the globe which has prepared for war has got what it prepared for? Did it ever occur to you that the United States, the only great nation under the sun which is unprepared for war, is the only great nation which is today enjoying peace and its infinite blessings? Does this suggest the relationship of cause and effect?

Whatever may be done by our government to further naval and military preparation, whatever may be essential in the way of further naval and military preparation, the United States should continue in the future as in the past to rely chiefly upon moral rather than upon military force, and to dedicate itself to the principles of humanity and to the idea and ideals of peace, arbitration and international justice.

The cause of international peace never stood in such sore need of friends as at the present hour. This is, indeed, the darkest hour in all its history. But let us hope that the pending darkness is but that ominous darkness which precedes and which presages the coming splendors of the dawn.